

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,442	08/30/2001	Shai Ben-Levy	3524/30	7676
29858 7590 03/20/2007 THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP 900 THIRD AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 03/20/2007 PAP		ER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/943,442	BEN-LEVY ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Olabode Akintola	3691					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 De	ecember 2006.						
·							
·—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5-37 and 39-41</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 38</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	-						
, , ,							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
The bath of declaration is objected to by the Ex-	animer. Note the attached Office	Action of John F 10-132.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
 Certified copies of the priority documents 	s have been received.	•					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Application	on No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
•							
Attachment(s)							
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Notice of Informal Patent Application							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/30/01; 3/12/02</u> .	6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/943,442

Art Unit: 3691

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Invention I (claims 1-4 and 38) in the reply filed on 12/14/2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that invention II (claims 5 and 39) would not be unduly burdensome. This is not found persuasive because the two inventions are able to support separate patents and are independent. Even though, the inventions are in same class and sub class, there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required. The aspect of invention that would constitute additional burden for the examiner includes two separate proposed auctions each having a reserve price whereas invention I comprises a single proposed auction and at least one proposed non-auction, both without the reserve price feature.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, it is not clear how the recited steps in the body of the claim achieve the "trading financial interests" as recited in the preamble.

Application/Control Number: 09/943,442

Art Unit: 3691

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence (US 5915209) ("Lawrence") in view of BuyTextile.com ("BuyTextile").

Re claims 1-4 and 38: Lawrence teaches a method of trading financial interests, the method comprising: receiving via a computer network terms for a proposed auction in financial interests and associating with said proposed auction a deadline for deciding said proposed auction (abstract, col.1, lines 7-27; col. 3, lines 41-54; col. 7, line 62-col. 8, line 29). Lawrence does not explicitly teach receiving via a computer network terms for at least one proposed non-auction transaction in at least one of said financial interests; and identifying said proposed non-auction transaction as an entry in said proposed auction. BuyTextile teaches receiving via a computer network terms for at least one proposed non-auction transaction; and identifying said proposed non-auction transaction as an entry in said proposed auction (Page 3 of

4; "Buy it now"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lawrence to include this step as taught by BuyTextile. One would have been motivated to do so in order to enable the system to add a fixed-price option to the auction so that the transaction can be concluded faster.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA